

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

Gregory T. Howard,

Case No. 3:04CV7558

Plaintiff

v.

ORDER

Cynthia M. Kozak, et al.,

Defendant

This is an employment discrimination case which was dismissed on October 6, 2004. Dissatisfied with that outcome, which was entirely merited, the plaintiff has repeatedly sought to revive his complaint with frivolous motions.

The most recent of these is a motion, filed February 8, 2006. In that motion, plaintiff seeks leave to file a motion to vacate under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e).

He must seek leave to do so because in a prior order, he has been denied the opportunity to file further pleadings without first obtaining leave to do so.

That order has not deterred his filing of frivolous motions. His instant motion is as frivolous as his prior motions, and leave to file a Rule 59(e) motion shall be denied.

Because the plaintiff persists in filing frivolous pleadings in this case, I conclude that the only remedy is bar him entirely from filing any pleadings in this case [except, if he chooses and

prepays the requisite filing fee, a notice of appeal]. He shall also be barred permanently from filing suit against the parties to this case. It is time that their travail, and this court's, come to an end.

It is, therefore

ORDERED THAT:

1. Plaintiff's motion for leave to file a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) denied; and
2. Except for a notice of appeal, for which plaintiff shall be required to file the requisite filing fee, plaintiff shall not file, under penalty of contempt, any further pleadings in this case or institute or maintain suit against the defendants in this case, and the Clerk shall accept no such pleadings, except a notice of appeal.

So ordered.

S/ James G. Carr  
Chief Judge